

# The Merrill-Palmer Quarterly

Established to further the objectives of the Merrill-Palmer School by presenting material relative to the concerted efforts of numerous professional disciplines toward the advancement of knowledge in the many areas of family living.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Ralph E. Sloan, *Editor*

Martin L. Hoffman	Ivor Johnson Echols	William W. McKee	D. Keith Osborn
Aaron L. Rutledge	Marjorie D. Sanger	Leland H. Stott	

VOL. 2	FALL	1955
--------	------	------

	<i>Page</i>
PREVENTIVE APPLICATIONS OF PSYCHIATRY	
Benjamin Spock, M.D. . . . .	3
VALUES AND THE INTRODUCTION OF CHANGE	
John Collier . . . . .	13
A SIMPLIFIED RECORD SYSTEM FOR COUNSELORS	
Aaron L. Rutledge . . . . .	23
IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT VALUES IN EDUCATION AND TEACHING AS RELATED TO GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	
Rhoda Mètraux . . . . .	27
IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT VALUES IN THE GROUP PROCESS AS RELATED TO HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	
Aaron Stern . . . . .	35
M-P PLANS AND PROJECTS . . . . .	40
BOOK REVIEW . . . . .	43

The MERRILL-PALMER QUARTERLY; published four times yearly by the Merrill-Palmer School, 71 E. Ferry, Detroit 2, Michigan. Subscription: \$1.50 per volume; single copies, 50 cents. Printed in U.S.A.

Manuscripts consonant with the objectives of the MERRILL-PALMER QUARTERLY may be submitted for possible publication consideration, should be typed, double- or triple-spaced, upon good, white paper. The original should be submitted. References should be arranged in alphabetical order or in the sequence in which they are referred to in text and typed in numerical order on separate sheets; corresponding numbers should be properly located in the text. Footnotes and text designations of them should be clearly indicated. Illustrations should show on the margin (on the back of photographs) the name of the author and an abbreviated title of the paper, as well as identification for insertion in text. Photographs should be glossy prints, unmounted.

R v.2 Fall '55 - Summer '56

## IN MEMORIAM



Winifred Rand  
1881-1955

A RARE COMBINATION of personal and professional qualities characterized Winifred Rand, member of the Merrill-Palmer staff for eighteen years (1924-1942), who died November 17, 1955 at her home in Francetown, New Hampshire. A New Englander by birth, education, and early professional endeavor, Miss Rand came to Merrill-Palmer when the institution was young and contributed much to the development of its program. She came to take a position and fulfil a purpose then unique, namely, to interpret the homes and community contacts of the nursery school children to the Merrill-Palmer community, and Merrill-Palmer to the parents. Thus began early the endeavor to understand and interpret the "whole child" in relation to his total environment. That the home and the parents were the most important elements in this constellation Miss Rand never overlooked or failed to emphasize. Though her services broadened to include many other tasks, she continued to carry this primary responsibility with distinction, giving it meaning and importance in our program.

A graduate of Smith and Simmons colleges, Miss Rand was also a registered nurse, trained at Boston's Children's Hospital. Before coming to Merrill-Palmer she had been on the staff of Lincoln Settlement House, Boston, then successively Superintendent of Nurses and Director of the Baby Hygiene Association and Director, Division of Child Hygiene, Community Health Association, Boston. Throughout her career she contributed to the nursing profession, serving for eight years as an officer of the national Public Health Nurses' association, and developing recognition, through many papers, programs, and addresses, of the importance to nurses of a knowledge of child development and parent education. She was co-author of the widely used book, *Growth and Development of the Young Child*, first published in 1930, and of *Essentials of Pediatrics for Nurses*, with Philip C. Jeans, M.D., first published in 1934. She contributed many articles, all bearing the impress of her original thinking and wide experience, to periodical literature.

To Winifred Rand, as to the great humanitarian Albert Schweitzer, reverence for life was a guiding principle. As counselor and friend to parents and children, she was aware always of the individual person and his unique mind and spirit, as well as of the immediate problem presented.

Through the years of her illness in retirement, borne with courage, though with dismay that she was unable to pursue her work, her interest in Merrill-Palmer persons and events never flagged. In her we lost one of the makers of the institution and a beloved friend.

—Dorothy Tyler

PRE

## PREVENTIVE APPLICATIONS OF PSYCHIATRY \*

BENJAMIN SPOCK, M.D.

I would like to emphasize in a perhaps overly opinionated and personal way some opportunities for preventive psychiatry which do not involve direct psychotherapy but rather the application of psychiatric knowledge in other fields. I would like first to refer to some of the *abnormal* situations in which children find themselves—abandoned, neglected and abused young children, and older delinquent children in custodial institutions. Then I want to discuss children in average homes and how they are influenced by medical advice and by their schooling. Lastly I want to look at parent education.

John Bowlby's masterly review,<sup>1</sup> for the World Health Organization of the literature relating to the effects of the deprivation of maternal care on the personalities of very young children shows an essential unanimity of opinion: Infants severely deprived, in inadequately staffed institutions, show, if they do not die, disastrous retardation of physical, mental and emotional development, which is largely irreversible. Lesser degrees of deprivation are somewhat less devastating but tend to produce shallow personalities—impulsive, demanding, irresponsible—who become poor students, poor workmen, and poor parents.

The lesson is clear that infants unwanted or abandoned should preferably be adopted or at least placed in stable foster homes without delay.

In America today there is earnest questioning, in child placing agencies, about the techniques and procedures used in placement, particularly those concerned with evaluating the developmental status of the baby, which sometimes cause delay in placement and thus threaten the very health they are meant to insure, and which are often of doubtful validity. It is certainly agreed that the best method for assuring an early and sound decision on the part of the natural mother is careful case work during the pregnancy. There is considerable doubt about criteria with which to judge the suitability of prospective adopting parents for the simple-seeming but exacting job of rearing children.

Another even larger group of children needing the serious concern of all professionals interested in mental health are those who grow up

\* Read at the International Institute on Child Psychiatry, Toronto, Canada, August 14, 1954.

in their own families but with parents who are unloving or neglectful or actively abusive. Children in this general category, on the way to becoming psychopathic personalities, whether merely shallow and irresponsible or more actively antisocial, are relatively difficult and unrewarding to treat (compared to the psychoneurotic children of psychoneurotic, ambivalent parents). Furthermore, if we are realistic we will admit that such personalities are being created at a rate that would occupy ten or twenty times the number of child psychiatrists we have now or will have in this century.

Though these children will be brought forcibly to our attention later as delinquents and criminals, it seems to me that we make pathetically little effort to recognize them or help them in the early stages when something constructive might be attempted. To be sure, the more flagrantly abusive parents may be brought into court and the children placed in foster homes. But for every such case I believe there are ten where there is insufficient legal basis for removing the child from the home and yet where his personality distortion will be almost as bad.

Theoretically a family and children's social casework agency is the means for helping such a family. My experience has been that this avenue is illusory in a majority of such cases. The agency is already overworked. They prefer to reserve their time for families who seek their help and show greater responsiveness. The approaches they use too often lack appeal for the neglectful or abusive parent, and there is a lack of resources for young neglected, but not completely rejected, children. I would like to see vigorous experimentation with nursery schools for such children, nursery schools staffed with the very best of teachers and with social workers prepared to dovetail their efforts with the teachers' efforts at all levels.

For the neglecting parents—who are only neglected children chronologically grown up—we should make greater experimental efforts with neighborhood houses, church clubs and other community groups to see whether by going nine-tenths of the way in accepting them, we can engender more acceptance in them for their children. The principal is sound. It is our efforts that are weak.

The question might be raised whether we have techniques for finding the emotionally disturbed children early in childhood.

Dr. Frederick H. Stone<sup>2</sup> of Israel has spoken with imagination, honesty, and humor about the problems involved in developing techniques for finding with any certainty those mother-child relationships which are significantly disturbed. I agree that to get scientific answers in a careful research project is difficult. Also I assume that with our present incomplete knowledge, our guesses about which children who are somewhat disturbed in the early years will be most disturbed later will often be wrong. But I still want to insist that from a practical,



service point of view there is no excuse for waiting for better case finding methods before starting our early preventive efforts. The experienced psychologists and nursery school teachers at the Rochester (Minn.) Child Health Institute felt that it was only necessary to sit with a group of ten three-year-old children and their mothers for an hour or so to gain a good preliminary impression of which children were reasonably well adjusted and which ones had difficulties that needed further investigation (unpublished experiences). I believe that the sensitive physician or public health nurse in the well child clinic examining room, a good psychologist or nursery school teacher in the waiting room can spot the children with questionable adjustment in a few minutes' observation.

The other special group badly in need of better care are the delinquents in so-called training schools. In a majority of these institutions the spirit of the care is still in the dark ages and hardens more souls than it redeems. In the minority of children's courts and institutions in which understanding and friendliness and professional skills, including psychiatry, are used vigorously, it has been proven that a great majority of court cases can and should be kept at home under careful probation supervision, and that most of the small minority needing institutionalization can be at least partially rehabilitated there. The callous way in which most of our communities ignore this responsibility will some day seem as shocking as the chaining of psychotics in dungeons in previous centuries seems inexcusable to us today.

You may ask why I am laboring the need of a more psychiatrically oriented approach to the problems of these abandoned, neglected and delinquent children, to psychiatric workers who already would agree. I am complaining that we in child psychiatry pay plenty of lip service to these needs but throw ourselves into the battle too seldom or too little. Part of the cause is that we receive such justified gratification from the results we achieve in the obviously treatable cases that crowd into our waiting rooms that our consciences are well satisfied and the needs of the less treatable seem fairly remote.

My plea is that child psychiatry personnel make the great effort necessary to reserve some of their time and energy for more consultative work with family agencies, child placing agencies, for training non-psychiatric child care workers, for experimentation with untraditional approaches other than individual psychotherapy, and raise their voices to the public and to the legislatures of the world about the gross ignorance of children's needs on the part of society generally. I believe that a reasonable share of our efforts devoted to these areas will be of appreciable benefit to many more children than we can treat ourselves.

Now let's turn to preventive psychiatry as it applies to average

children in average families. Because it is close to my own concern, I think first of the value of a sound approach on the part of the pediatrician or family doctor as he advises the parents of children. In America and Canada the pediatrician has acquired an amazing authority with parents. If he acts at all interested, he is questioned about weaning, toilet training, sleep problems, the advisability of nursery school. His word is particularly weighty to the conscientious and inexperienced parent, and particularly concerning the problems of infancy and very early childhood.

How can psychiatrists help him to discharge wholesomely this serious responsibility? Many of us in child psychiatry have wrestled hard and long with this problem, and I know no one who is satisfied that he has found a very satisfactory answer, certainly no easy answer. Most of us have recognized a growing demand from pediatricians for help, particularly in the form of neat, quick solutions, but we have also felt in the majority of pediatricians a strong resistance to the teaching approaches we feel are best. Certainly, and I feel justifiably, they reject psychodynamic theory in psychiatric terminology. But even when we strive for everyday language in our generalizations they ask rather for practical techniques; but if we stick to cases they seem to switch around and ask for an all-inclusive and systematic theory. I think we have all been disappointed to see that some of our pediatric students who reach the stage where we can discuss, with mutual understanding in words, the meaning and management of a problem, nevertheless lag far behind their apparent intellectual grasp when they come to deal with the parent or child in actual practice.

Unable to believe that our own efforts are at fault, we look for other explanations. We blame, in part correctly, the fact that the young pediatrician's *other* teachers are so constantly ignoring or subtly doubting a psychodynamic approach, that they continually undo our more sporadic efforts at indoctrination. I, and I believe many others like me, blame not just the pediatric phase of training but the subtly impersonal ideal of much of the four years of medical school teaching. We suspect especially that the first two years of most of our American medical schools which are devoted exclusively to the basic laboratory courses, not only fail to increase the student's sensitivity to human emotional needs, but actually desensitize him, and depersonalize his conception of his future patients. More specifically we suspect that he as student is assailed with the same anxiety which would be normal in any human being on having to dissect a dead person, fish in tuberculous sputum or handle a cancerous stomach, and that the easiest means of disposing, by himself, of this anxiety, protecting himself from it, is to learn to suppress such feelings or to scorn them. He is aided in

this effort by his identification with preclinical teachers who themselves have chosen the impersonal fields of medicine.

We believe that if these assumptions are correct we must reintroduce the patient as a feeling person into the first two years of medical school, encourage and inspire the student to a discriminating sympathy with the patient, and then be prepared to deal somewhat therapeutically with excess anxiety in students when and if it appears.

Next I want to discuss the mental health potentials of elementary and secondary schools. Every child is in school for a good part of his childhood and is almost as profoundly affected by his teachers as by his parents. It is a common experience in history taking to hear a mother describe the variations in her child's nervous tension as he encounters different teachers, becoming worse, for example, when under a harsh, threatening disciplinarian, but immediately improving when in the class of a friendly and understanding teacher. Psychological studies have shown clearly that not only the teacher's basic personality, but the conscious philosophy and the specific techniques she uses, influence the atmosphere of the classroom, the amount of friendliness (or unfriendliness) engendered between students, their capacity for responsibility, their inner discipline.

But this kind of schooling calls for better equipment, smaller classes, and teachers selected carefully for appropriate personality and motivation, and well educated themselves as to the nature of children.

We have learned that good teachers must be backed up by psychologists for testing and remedial reading, and by guidance counsellors or school social workers to work with those children who are having trouble, and with their parents. To function safely and comfortably I believe that the counsellors and social workers themselves should be backed up by child psychiatrists, who may treat the most serious problems, supervise the work of the counsellors or social workers and foster the in-service training of the teachers themselves in regard to children's wholesome and unwholesome behavior. These supervisory and educational functions are more difficult, especially in a non-psychiatric field, than psychotherapy in a clinic but I believe that psychiatry owes this to education. In return the psychiatric workers can learn much from good teachers. I believe that the main hope of improving the mental health of children and thus the mental health of all ages of people lies in the closest cooperation between psychiatric workers and teachers both for the better service of specific children and for the advancement of our general understanding of all children and how to meet their needs.

Now for the final and most elusive approach to mental health: parent education. We Americans have thrown ourselves into a variety of direct activities: prenatal classes and pamphlets that emphasize

emotional development and emotional needs of children; mothers' clubs, parent-teacher associations, family life and child study associations; books, newspaper columns, radio programs aimed at teaching parents what to do and what not to do; mental hygiene societies and mental health films attempting to alert citizens generally to the prevalence of mental illness, the importance of early signs and early treatment and principles of prevention.

Though most of these efforts have been constructive and helpful, I believe that some of them have missed the target and, in a subtle way, have done more harm than good. I mean particularly any approaches, however kindly, which leave parents feeling more guilty, and any approaches that increase parents' belief that experts know better than parents. I think that our individual psychiatric work has shown us that one can only to a very limited degree teach parents, on an intellectual level, how to rear or how not to rear children. We have plenty of evidence that parents do well to the degree that they have come through happy childhoods of their own and identified successfully with their own parents. When the best parents come to managing their own children and show love or disapproval, permit one kind of behavior and forbid or punish another, we know—or ought to know—that they express these attitudes spontaneously, unthinkingly, immediately. It is the troubled parents who have to stop and think what they ought to do or what the experts say they ought to do. They tell us that the thought-out method, however theoretically correct, too often fails to work, too often leaves the parent feeling either guilty or frustrated.

I have done my share of speaking to parent groups. I have a strong impression that such audiences usually contain a disproportionately large number of troubled parents who on the one hand are hunting desperately for the elusive solution to their child management problems and, on the other hand, at a more deeply unconscious level, are asking for a scolding. Too often they seem to find, in some casual remark of the lecturer, a new cause for anxiety or guilt. I have come to the conclusion that it is unsafe in such audiences to refer to psychopathology or to enumerate all the ideal attributes of parents which children need for normal development. The only harmless or mildly therapeutic approach is to talk about what average children are like, including all their unattractive qualities, and to declare that the best of parents can't help but be irritated with them a lot of the time. This brings vigorous nods of agreement and smiles of relief.

Let me admit at once that there are successful group approaches, even for very troubled parents, when the group is carefully chosen, when the leader is psychiatrically sophisticated and skilled, where known problems already exist, where the discussion comes largely from

the members, but where the leader keeps it constructively channeled.

I believe that the job of rearing children in America has been made more difficult, especially for less secure parents, by a number of special cultural factors, many of which are probably related to each other. America has been called a melting pot for a great variety of ethnic groups and though this melting has been enormously productive it has also dissolved traditions, at an uncomfortably rapid rate. Even when the immigrant parents have clung hard to old child rearing customs, their children have refused to a greater or lesser degree to conform, feeling justified by the existence of contrary customs in the community. Most of us would agree that any tradition, even one which has elements we considered psychologically undesirable, but which has been practically successful and long accepted, will work better in such a complicated interpersonal occupation as parenthood than a conflict of traditions or no tradition at all. In America it is said that we have a tradition against traditions in child rearing. Many Americans tend to be skeptical of the wisdom or the methods of their own parents in this field and thus cut themselves off at both conscious and unconscious levels, from their greatest potential sources of assurance. The only solution that I can see is to hope that time and consolidation will grow new traditions some day.

Meanwhile the vacuum has been filled to some degree by the findings and theories of scientists, semi-scientists and prophets in the fields of psychology, psychiatry, pediatrics and education. Certainly the more educated Americans have come to have a profound interest and belief in the ideas of the experts. Rationally this may be admirable but emotionally it is a poor substitute. One of the major difficulties has been that the scientists have, of course, discovered the truth not immediately, simultaneously and in toto but in small pieces and with controversy. Each piece has seemed to its discoverer as the final answer. Only after application in practice has its incompleteness or one-sidedness been shown. In the last fifty years the trusting laity has been buffeted back and forth by the tides of rigidity and flexibility, permissiveness and control.

We cannot try to halt the acquisition of knowledge. We can only hope that we are somewhere near a rounded concept of the child's nature and the parent's job and that this can be stabilized into a new tradition. We can suspect that though it may be expressed in 20th or 21st century terminology it will turn out to be surprisingly like some of the best of the old-fashioned traditions that long antedated science. It might be well to repeat this thought in other words: that scientists in the child rearing professions have been struggling to delineate what good parents, from the beginning of the human race, have learned without effort before they were five years old.

So far I have been mainly skeptical and unconstructive about parent education. I want to come back to it once more, in relation to childhood education in general, because I believe that it is back in elementary, secondary and college education that we have our main opportunities to influence parental education.

I omit the period before kindergarten, though it is the most important of all, because here children are left to their own educational methods. The parents serve as the vital models, for better or worse, but the children do all the work, practicing enthusiastically for hours at a time, taking the roles of father and mother, using dolls or the more submissive children as babies. If we could conserve this delight in parenthood for fifteen or twenty more years we would be well on our way to solving our problem.

But in our kind of society much of the enjoyment and sense of importance in playing parent seems to get lost between five and twenty. I believe that education unwittingly plays a part.

As a pediatric practitioner I was repeatedly distressed to see young mothers, about to leave the lying-in hospital with their first baby, almost weeping with anxiety about their lack of readiness. They worried about how they'd know when the baby was hungry, what to do when he cried, whether they would be able to hold him correctly or hold on to him in the bath. I believe myself that women with more formal education are more often susceptible to this pathetic lack of assurance. If this is true there are, of course, other possible reasons but I still think it plausible that the type of education itself contributes significantly to the effect. For the more serious our academic education becomes, the more it teaches respect for expert knowledge, mistrust of the lack of it. The educated woman assumes that there are correct answers, but also assumes she does not know them. It is as if she were about to take a final examination in baby care with the nightmarish realization that she has never attended a class. To say that some highly educated but highly secure women feel no such panic does not relieve education of this responsibility.

I am thinking not just of the failure of traditional academic education to cover fields of knowledge that would be appropriate for parenthood. I am thinking of the impersonal spirit of most academic education. I am thinking of the implication, in a majority of courses, that the world gives recognition for the career outside the home, but takes for granted parenthood; this latter creates a dramatic conflict for many capable, educated women which is never completely resolved. In a more subtle way it probably impairs the family contribution of men, too.

The best modern educators led by men like Dewey and Kilpatrick have realized that true education comes from experiencing and doing.



I think it is the responsibility of psychiatry to not only support these educators but to encourage them to go further, on the basis of our understanding of the deeper and unconscious motivations of man.

We know clinically that in essence the intellect is different from the emotions no matter how well they are integrated in the healthy individual. We know further that over-intellectualization is a defense against feeling, which impairs good function. I am saying that our traditional education, from kindergarten through professional school, has been allowed through the centuries to drift further and further from an emotional preparation for life and that to this extent it unprepares us for our main function: to get along effectively and enjoyably with other human beings not only in our families but in our work.

The best of modern educators have urged that in an appropriate grade in elementary school the children learn their arithmetic and human relations by running the school store so that they add and subtract and multiply for a good, live reason rather than because the teacher says so, and that when they have to deal with a difficult student-customer they discuss naturally and spontaneously their own and others feelings. In secondary school they emphasize that adolescents are primarily concerned with themselves: their bodies, their new awareness, their conflicts with their parents, their anxieties about social and romantic acceptance. The educators therefore say that biology should be brought down to the students' level of concern, that literature and history offer constant opportunities for wholesome discussion, and comparison of their own and each other's philosophies.

The higher up we go on the academic ladder the less recognition there is in most colleges of this basic proposition that the proper subject of education for man is man, not so much *other* men but this man-student himself and his classmates. In higher education we still hear the sterile argument whether the purpose is vocational preparation or the achievement of some vague scholarly outlook on life. I would say that they are not alternatives, that both are necessary, but that both are ineffectual if they are not part of a larger, simpler purpose: to foster the student's capacity to live and work understandingly and enjoyably with other human beings. In most colleges, when the students are still intensely concerned with their anatomies and physiologies, biology instead of starting and thoroughly dealing with humans, discreetly and all too logically backs up to the paramecium. Only gingerly does it approach the human at the end of the year and then he is not recognizable as the breathing, feeling student, but only as a collection of bodily systems. The generative system, most highly charged with interest, is postponed 'till the last week before examinations. College psychology, potentially one of the most constructively



absorbing subjects, too often is systematically robbed of most of its meaning by starting, logically but wrongly, with the single neuron and then spending months tracing the professor's preoccupation with definitions, theories, and the history of the evolution of the subject.

I am not ignoring the need for thorough and detailed education in many complex and technical fields in our modern world. The student of psychology must know about neurons and theories, but he would come to these naturally and with better motivation after satisfying his curiosity about the psychology of himself and the people he knows. The medical student must know anatomy but it would be safer for him to get to it because of concern for a patient, and then he will master it more meaningfully.

The lawyer must know about laws and the minister about religion. But I am suggesting that these professional people will be much more satisfactory lawyers to their clients and ministers to their parishioners, that they will be better husbands to their wives and fathers to their children, if their professional training keep man—not just legal-man or man the church goer, but feeling-man, the student-man—always in the center of focus, and the technical aspects of the profession secondary and peripheral.

If you ask me how far I would go, I'll be less opinionated and say that it must be the educators who take the lead and we in psychiatry should be their consultants and supporters. I'd certainly like to see experiments with getting rid of all examinations, getting rid of all vindictive teachers, removing all over-intellectualized teachers from beginning courses, taking the students out of the classroom and into life situations in which they functioned as participators for fully 50% of their hours. If this sounds too novel I'd answer that it's the way all education worked until the past twenty-five centuries and the way it works still in the simple cultures today. The child strives mightily to pattern himself after the parent he loves and with whom he identifies, and the parent permits him to participate under his guidance to the degree he is ready.

#### REFERENCES

1. Bowlby, J.—Maternal Care and Mental Health, World Health Organization Monograph Series, Geneva 1951.
2. Stone, Frederick H.—A Critical Review of a Current Programme of Research into Mother-Child Relationship (Unpublished).

## VALUES AND THE INTRODUCTION OF CHANGE

CONTINUED

JOHN COLLIER \*

My next case is very much loaded with significance. For one thing it shows how, out of a small but wisely executed beginning, large results can flow. Another thing it shows is the way that any group of people in the world may be able to supply something that the whole world needs—supply an example or an achievement that the nations of the world need. More than this, it represents the return of the American mind to that relation with nature which is one of co-operation and brotherhood rather than exploitation; in other words, a return to wholeness.

Western civilization has a peculiarity which marks it off from the Oriental, the African, and American Indian cultures, and that is that starting far back toward the end of the great period of Greece, of Athens, the western mind divorced itself from nature. Always previously all men had thought of nature and man as parts of each other. Man flowed into nature and nature flowed into man. Man's emotions were not bounded by man. They flowed into animals, plants, land. And the early Greeks thought that way.

But at the end of the thirty years of war between Sparta and Athens, the war that disrupted Greece, destroyed the city states of Greece, pulverized the community of Greece, arose the supreme thinker, Plato. And Plato developed a philosophy which separated man from nature absolutely. It also separated the intellect in man from his emotions, absolutely. Nature became alien and the feeling part of man became alien. So brilliant and glorious is the philosophy of Plato that the platonic view passed over into Christianity and Christianity viewed man as wholly apart from nature. That animals have no souls was the belief of the Christian world, and that came on down into the beginnings of modern thought. For example,

\* The third of a series of talks by the Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Anthropology, College of the City of New York, during a "Summer Seminar for Foreign Students" at The Merrill-Palmer School. The lecturer formerly was U.S. Commissioner for Indian Affairs. The lectures were recorded, transcribed, and minimal adaptations for publication were made by Dorothy Lee, Ph.D., cultural anthropologist, The Merrill-Palmer School.

Descartes the great fountain head of so much modern thought, viewed all animals are mere automatons—without consciousness. Only man had consciousness, he alone in a dead universe. And this is the view which has come down to us.

With this view you can well understand how natural it has been for the white man in this country to proceed and devastate the landscape, pollute the streams, annihilate the wildlife, deforest the timber lands, and allow his soil to be washed and blown away. He was only exploiting them. They were not a part of him. In all of this the white man for a long time has stood out in dramatic contrast to the Indians of India, to all of the African peoples, the people of Oceania and the American Indians. Well, now we come to our example.

The fact that our resources were being destroyed at a ruinous speed was recognized by Theodore Roosevelt, the great earlier Roosevelt who was President right after 1900. He preached the need of conservation and he did create the United States Forest Service which has conserved a hundred million acres of our timber land. But in the decades after Roosevelt, all our attempts to stop the wastage, especially of soil and water, were carried out either through mere engineering operations, just mechanical engineering—soil engineering as we used to call it—or through passing laws requiring that people practice conservation on their land and establishing penalties if they did not. Neither method checked at all the growing wastage of soil, the critical erosion. And so it went on until the year 1933. At that time (I am having to give this in a somewhat egotistical way to make it real to you; but may role was accidental), I was made the head of the Indian Bureau by Franklin Roosevelt. And I was aware of the fact that the grazing land, especially of the Indians, was in a bad condition of erosion and waste. I didn't know much more than that, but I did know that over in the Department of Agriculture there was a man who had ideas. He was shut away in a little laboratory called the Bureau of Soils Chemistry. He had no field organization at all and was purely a research worker. His name was Hugh Bennett. I sent one of my young assistants over to see what this man Bennett was like. And I recall the enormous excitement that this young man brought back from his first talk with Bennett, who gave him his first understanding of the ecological approach, the possibility of saving the land not through engineering work and not through police regulation, but through working with the land so that the land could come back. Bennett had no opportunity to demonstrate his ideas. Immediately I brought about the creation of interdisciplinary scientific team whose chairman was Bennett. The team included an economist, a public administration specialist, and an anthropologist. They went out onto

the ground and they surveyed the Navajo Indian Reservation and found that it was indeed in a frightful state. They set down in a brief lucid report, intended to be understood by the Indians, what the conditions were and what they thought could be done. That report was presented to the Navajo Tribe at the first meeting of the Navajo Tribal Council in 1933. It was accepted by the Tribe, and the Tribe proceeded to put into operation the first basin-wide soil conservation work that the world had known since the downfall of the Inca Empire.

Now I'm going to switch a little bit in the narrative to another Indian group, Acoma Pueblo, which is east of the Navajo Reservation by a few miles. The examination of its land found that in 1935 the Acoma Indians were running 33,000 sheep, or sheep units as it's called, on a range so badly eroded and trampled out that it could really support only 8,500 head. So that the first thing they were called upon to do to save their land was to give up all but 8,500 of their 33,000 sheep. Now the ownership of the sheep among the Acomas is individual ownership, it is not communal. The sacrifices had to be made by individuals. In addition to that they would need to move it and do an enormous amount of terracing and contour plowing and re-seeding of devastated areas.

Well, these facts were laid before the Acomas and I made them the expressed pledge. I said, "The government has power to compel you to do these things, to compel you to get rid of those too many sheep that you have, and so on. We have the authority but we'll never use it." I gave them a pledge valid for as long as Roosevelt remained President; that we'd never bring compulsion to bear on them. Furthermore, I told them. "You've got to do this if you do it through your own decision and in your own way. And I'm not going to inquire and nobody else is going to inquire how you arrive at your decisions. They're within your own private councils." This discussion went on for a good many months and then Acomas announced unani-mously that they were prepared to go ahead and do everything on their own and in their own way, and they did. They actually did reduce their sheep from 33,000 to 8,500 and within five years they had brought their land back until it was a garden of Eden. They were motivated by the ancient primitive world's motive, that the land and man are one. Sick land means sick men. Dead land means dead men. A wound to the land is a wound to me. They were moved by their old stone age view which is still their view.

Well, these demonstrations in the Southwest among the Indians were so dramatic that they attracted the attention of conservationists everywhere and of a lot of other people. They made it possible for Hugh Bennett to move forward and establish what has become to be known as the Soil Conservation District among the white people. A

Soil Conservation District is an area of land which insofar as possible is a river basin, or a watershed, containing the uplands, and timbers, the rolling hill country, the farm land, and the town. It is a new unit of human enterprise. And faithfully adhering to what we would call the "Acoma Formula," there was enacted in 1936 the Federal United States Soil Conservation Act, which had to be made effective through complementary supplemental acts by each state, and then it merely was hung in suspension until the land-users in a given conservation soil district chose to organize the district. When they did organize it nobody had power to regulate them and they had no power to regulate each other. A soil conservation service was developed at Washington which was to render technical advice but had no authority and has no authority.

Now within the soil conservation district you can see how what we've been calling the life space of an individual is modified. Heretofore a man has been concentrating on his own little farm. Now he thinks of a whole watershed and his farm is a component part of the watershed. What happens anywhere in the watershed influences the condition of his farm, influences the depth of his water table. Also whatever he does that is good for his land benefits the whole watershed. The people in the towns realize that if the land can be conserved by these ecological methods tax values will go up; the power of the people to buy things will go up; bank deposits will go up. And so we find the people in the towns, the urban people, flinging themselves into the work of saving the watershed along with the little farmers, and the big farmers, the people who run cattle, the people who run sheep, and the people who grow timber.

There are now 2,000 of these soil conservation districts, all of them going concerns. They embrace a good many more than a thousand million acres of land, including nearly all of the land that previously had been damaged by erosion. A billion acres of farm and grazing land is a lot of land. It is more than the total farmland area of Germany and France combined. And these soil conservation districts are distributed all the way from Maine to California, up and down the country. They are most completely developed in Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Pennsylvania, so that now the wastage of resources of soil and water has been put in reverse in this country. We really are saving the land. Now the cost to the government—what is it? The total cost of the soil conservation service, worked out on an acreage basis for the area being conserved is five cents an acre a year. That expenditure is trivial when you consider that within a soil conservation district the crop yields, the livestock yields, jump 100% within three years and farm values rise correspondingly. If the entire supply

of government money were withdrawn, still the soil conservation districts would go on, and they would have to create their own overhead technical service. I don't think it matters whether they do it, or whether they go on the way they're going, inasmuch as the role of the government in soil conservation work is unauthoritarian, very economical, completely decentralized, and democratic.

Now the wastage of soil and water is a world-wide phenomenon—the silent crisis of the world. Ultimately it is far more important than all of the noisy cold-war or hot-war. As for the number of people involved in this soil conservation district work there are more than ten million individuals, a substantial portion of the whole rural and small-town population of the United States.

Now the next case I am going to speak of is a negative one falling within the record of the Navajos. They are non-English speaking, and they have their own ancient religion. They are pure blood Indians, the largest tribe in the United States, 65,000 of them; and they live by raising sheep, a little farming, and the production of arts and crafts.

About fifteen years ago the government moved into an area of the Navajo Reservation through which the San Juan River flows, a river that dumps into the Colorado a few miles away from this place, Fruitlands. And there the government built diversion dams and constructed an irrigation system for the Navajos. It was a perfectly conceived engineering layout for the Navajos to come there and farm; and the Navajos were very poor. Right across the river the Mormons who are marvelous farmers were growing superb crops of alfalfa, beans, and many other crops. Well, fifteen years have passed and the government has gone on maintaining this perfect irrigation system. About three-quarters of its remains unused. About three-fifths of the irrigated area is just lying unused. The area that is used produces crops so poor that they represent only one-fifth of the crop yield which the Mormons get right across the river where the Indians can see it. The Indians are hungry; the Indians are poor. There is land and they don't use it, or when they use it they are so careless that it doesn't produce much.

Now a study has been made of why this is the way it is, a study by John Adair of Cornell University. Cornell operates a field station at Fruitlands, and Adair has published his results in a book. (See Spicer, Edward H., ed., *Human Problems in Technological Change*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation 1952.) Adair gives a picture of the Navajo way of life. The first thing about a Navajo way of life is that it is cooperative. Groups of big families, called "outfits," occupy considerable bodies of range-land and they render mutual aid all the time. The "outfit" is really the economic unit. Woman is the center of Navajo life and holds in her hands the fate of nearly everything



Navajo. In addition to that, the Navajo trains his children from infancy up by having them work on the land with the sheep. They take part in all of the family occupations from the time they're babies.

Now the government after it built this irrigation system, instead of going and saying to a certain number of "outfits," "Won't you move in and take over this land?"—sent representatives who went out all over the reservation and picked out individual Indians who said they would like to come and take up this land; people who had had no previous relation to each other, no cooperative relationship. And all of the extension work was directed only at the man; the woman was left out. In addition, the Navajo adult, male and female, spends about a third of his time in religious and healing ceremonies. Frequently, he goes fifty or a hundred miles away to a "sing," or another religious ceremony, and is absent for days. He leaves the children then in complete charge of flocks and land and everything else. Well, the Navajos in Fruitlands also spent a third of their time worshipping and being way, leaving the children in charge. But this is complicated irrigated engineer farming in which the children have been given no instruction, so that the children are helpless to take care of the ditches, the floodgates, and to avoid the washing away of the land by too much water; and so on.

John Adair makes it perfectly clear that we have failed at Fruitlands by simply ignoring the social pattern of the Indians, the family pattern, the community pattern, the relation of the generations, the function of woman. We rely, just like the people in the "ground nuts" experiment we talked about this morning, on perfection of engineering. Well, we've gone further now; I hear constantly from Fruitlands, from John Adair, and my own son, a member of the Cornell Staff, who is stationed there. We spent a lot of money at Fruitlands to benefit the Navajo Indian; we spent millions of dollars. Today, the Navajo is so hostile to the white man, all white men, and all that the white man can offer him, that it is no longer possible to do field work in English. No more than one-half of the Navajos in Fruitlands talk English. They have rejected the language. They have completely hurled back upon us all our benefits. That kind of thing could happen the world over through the unwise application of what we call Point Four. We hope it won't happen, but it could happen. Well, that is a negative case. It is just as important to know how not to do things as to know how to do things.

Next, a word about T.V.A.—Tennessee Valley Authority. Some of you have been there I believe. Only a few words about just this aspect of it. T.V.A. shows exactly how it is possible to harmonize central authority, to bring together in a fruitful way, big things with little things. Some things have to be big, and the system of controlling



the Tennessee River is a big operation, a giant operation. That is not what makes the T.V.A. important. It is rather, that the T.V.A. is a new unit of government functioning without authority. It has no power to compel anybody to do anything. Its only power is to control the use of its dams and generating plants and to insist on the equitable system of current. Beyond that it has no power. It doesn't lie within the boundaries of any state, it flops over into North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and all of Eastern Tennessee. It has no authority nor does it supply subsidy to the free initiative that it brings into being. This great centralized T.V.A. operates all over that great vast area through thousands of agreements with little citizen-groups, or towns, or counties, or individual citizens in which the individual freely undertakes to do this or that in return for some technical advice. The whole thing is loose, flexible, voluntary, and therefor so popular that any attempt to break down the T.V.A. results in an uprising throughout the T.V.A. territory. It is getting the result of bigness without bringing everything under the dominion of the big. It is executing its mission through the utmost of free decentralized cooperation. These are phenomena in the United States which to many observers appear more important than a great many things that make a lot of noise. And nothing can cause it to change over into an authoritarian pattern; it is completely devoted to the decentralized and democratic way.

I think the next case is one which is peculiarly exciting and at the same time very sad, tragic. This is a case in London, England, known as the Peckham Experiment, an experiment in discovering how much human potential can be brought into expression. It has a hypothesis and a value system which is that the integrity of the family is supremely important. The biological family is essential, but it is essential that the biological family be able to function in an environment of other families in a community of families—otherwise, it will be a sick family. That is the essence of the hypothesis.

The people who started the Peckham Experiment and carried it on were biologists and physicians. They selected for their area a square mile of lower-middle class London. The average family income was in the vicinity of twenty dollars a week, which is a fairly low income. They were urban Britons, descendants of people who had passed through the fearful two generations of the industrial revolution of Britain. These people didn't themselves know how sick they were. And one of the striking discoveries of the Peckham Experiment, when everybody in the area was given physical examinations and other tests was an appalling rate of chronic disease. Ninety per cent (90%) of the women, approximately, and 80% of the men were suffering from grave defects, most of which they didn't know about.

Now the Peckham Experiment was set up in this way. It was a

community center, a beautiful and ample building. Membership was a membership always by the whole family, never by an individual; a whole family or nobody. The only exception being that the boy-friend, or the girl-friend, could come in as a part of the family. Only one requirement was placed on the family which was that every member submit to a periodic medical examination and then that the family attend a family consultation in which the findings, and the suggestions of the medical staff of what to do, were laid before the family. Peckham itself did not run the clinical services; it merely knew where the services could be had in London. Beyond that the people who came in were simply let alone. We had the spectacle of a community center, or social settlement if you will, as big as Hull House in Chicago, bigger than the Henry Street Settlement of New York, running with intense energy and with not a single social worker in the place. The only supervisory help provided was the lifeguard in the big swimming pool who did some teaching when he was asked to. The people were allowed to do spontaneously what they wanted to do. They had to find their own leadership among their own rank and file. They were not policed; everybody had his own key to everything. In the cafeteria you not only served yourself, but cooked your own food, and the cafeteria was largely supplied from biodynamic farm operated avocationally by the members of the Center.

The case records of the Peckham Experiment are very moving. The way specified families were beforehand, shut in on themselves, the members devouring each other—full of frustration. And then the change-over when they moved over into this new climate, this new life space. All of this was going full-blast, you may say, until the beginning of the World War. At once the Peckham plant was taken over by the government as a munitions plant, seized and used for munitions, and then the Peckham neighborhood became one of the worse bombed in London. It was pretty thoroughly bombed out. The people had no choice but to move elsewhere. And in the bombing all the records of Peckham were destroyed, thousands of clinical and case records, long before they could be used exhaustively.

Nevertheless, when the war was over, the fraction of the old population who remembered how things had been, proceeded to reorganize the Peckham Experiment. But their community center was a wreck. And in order to move ahead at all they had to go to a private bank and put their names on a note of \$120,000 to rehabilitate the wrecked building. These were poor people. They got the money, hoping that from some source they could arrange that the note would be taken up, before it was called. And the Center moved ahead. As late as 1948 it was going again full-blast, the same way. A myriad of creative activities, unsupervised, spontaneously organized, and led by the

people themselves. They shopped around England and the United States for some financial help. You would think that an experiment of this kind would get financial help. It didn't get any. And in the end they simply gave up and surrendered the properties to the bank. The Peckham Experiment died because no foundation could be interested enough to give or lend \$120,000 to this experiment in group dynamics and in public health; an experiment that encompassed the whole scope of public health, that achieved a public health revolution without rendering any clinical service because it struck over at the psychosomatic region of health and unhealth.

I have been asked to say a word about the Etawah Experiment in India. I know about the Etawah Experiment for a rather special reason. The United Provinces of India requested an American named Albert Mayer to come over there and see what could be done for the regeneration of the village community—saving of the land, the reindustrialization of the community, in general the renovation of village life. Mayer had had no rural life experience before. He was a city planner, an architect. But he had come to know Nehru during the World War and Nehru saw an equality of genius in Albert Mayer.

Mayer assembled a little staff of only four people, none of them sociologists, none of them anthropologists. I first knew about it when Mayer called on Laura Thompson and me for advice as to how to go about this thing. We had never been to India, but we had been handling situations of this kind in the western hemisphere for a long time and we gave him such advice as we could and reading material. Our principal advice was that by all means he do not increase his staff; that he let nothing tempt him to enlarge his area beyond a hundred villages, and that he depend upon village workers, people resident in the local village, for his liaison with the people.

Well, the Etawah Experiment went ahead. In these hundred villages within the three years extremely apparent transformations have taken place. The crop yields were up over more than one-third in the whole area. Important rehousing projects were under way in the villages. The village Panchayat was being reconstituted by the people themselves, (it is now being rebuilt through the policy of the government of India). The Panchayat comprises the headmen, the council of headmen, who advise the village and coordinate it. You must understand the village, the Indian village is a very complicated institution. It contains ten, or twenty, or thirty castes and a village will not be economically self-contained; the division of labor between villages is usually on the basis of caste. The pattern is very complicated and if Albert Mayer and his people had moved in there assuming they know that pattern and were to tell the villager where to get off they would have probably blundered about as bad as the white man did

at Fruitlands. They didn't do anything of the kind. They talked quietly with the villagers, with the leaders. They awaited the initiative to come, and it came. And when it came, it came in a flood. There took place a renaissance, a great flowering of life that had hardly been discovered before, that had been lying latent for hundreds of years. What took place is like what takes place on the Mojave desert, when it rains after twenty years or no rain. There comes a great rush of bloom, an intoxicating rush of bloom and odor in response to the rain. That is the kind of thing that seems to have happened at Etawah.

Now to generalize a little. How many village communities are there in India? I have seen the figure given as 500,000-750,000. That is 87% of the people of India. In old times the village community was many-sided. It was industrial as well as agricultural. The British killed its industry. At the same time population increased (and is increasing at five million a year in India) with no corresponding improvement in methods of land use, cattle breeding, or anything. The net effect has been a deepening poverty and an enormous volume of unemployment in the villages. The estimated idle man power in the Indian villages is fifty million people constantly. Now India could choose to modernize herself and industrialize by concentrating on primary and secondary industry in great cities. Drawing the people away from the land it could follow the examples of the United States or of Britain. It is not going to do that. It is going to follow the example of Scandinavia, which is one of the most intensively industrialized parts of the world. But what we have in Scandinavia is an intricately coordinated decentralized economic operation. The conscious choice of Gandhi and the leaders of India is the Scandinavian way and not the British or American way. India is going to revive her villages to the utmost extent possible. She is going to implant her secondary industries at least in local areas, in groups of villages. She is not going to create huge urban conglomerations any more than she has to, and it is for this reason that the Etawah project has been taken as a model on which a vastly expanded program is now being based. The number of villages involved in the expanded program is in the neighborhood of a hundred thousand, fully a hundred thousand and ten million people.

Now whether they are going to be able to secure the same profoundly spontaneous development all over is a problem. Are the people going to be too zealous? Will there be a lot of Indians who are going to try to do the American way? This is not the intention, but it is the danger. If India can only practice that patience which she has practiced so long, and be willing to wait, the growth of this movement from the people will come.

## A SIMPLIFIED RECORD SYSTEM FOR COUNSELORS

AARON L. RUTLEDGE\*

The bulk of individual counseling on any high school, college or university campus is accomplished by professors and other staff members as an activity over and above their regular duties. Particularly active as part-time counselors are the deans, house managers, personnel directors, chaplains, and professors of family life, home economics, sociology, and psychology. Only a few of the larger universities have services in conjunction with a health center or psychology department which provide psychotherapy for staff and students. In increasing number, colleges and universities are establishing counseling centers, but intensive service tends to be limited by lack of trained staff to the most disturbed individuals.

Whether a full or part-time activity, one of the basic requisites to intelligent handling of a problem by clinical counseling is a confidential record of interview material. The record serves as a basis for counseling in subsequent contact, as material for critical self-study of his technique and effectiveness, and as a source of reliable information in referral or in collaboration with other professional persons. If some uniformity of records could be established among counselors they would provide an invaluable resource for investigation of types of problems handled and methods and techniques used toward their resolution. Of course, such use necessarily would be contingent upon having a carefully selected research team and the clients' permissions.

Broad experience in counseling family members of all ages presenting varying problems, has resulted in the development of an effective method of keeping records of pertinent information. It requires a minimum of effort when only brief notes are possible and provides for a most complete record system when adequate secretarial assistance is available.

Two auxiliary needs are basic to an adequate record system; secretarial help and anonymity of the counselee in the handling of the records. Secretarial assistance may be inadequate for typing interview notes; in fact, for part-time counselors it may be limited to a student available for part-time secretarial help, or non-existent. The personality or level of development of a secretary may contraindicate ex-

---

\*Leader of The Counseling Service and The Counseling Training Program, The Merrill-Palmer School, 71 E. Ferry Ave., Detroit 2, Michigan.

posing her to information obtained in counseling. With student help a counselor may feel that it is unfair to burden her with the responsibility of keeping confidences and many students would not want fellow students to have access to material about them. Colleges and agencies are beginning to realize that adequate secretarial-receptionist staff is secondary in significance only to the qualifications of counselors in counseling and guidance programs.

Lock filing cabinets, or a safe, are essential and should be kept in a room which is securely locked when authorized personnel are not in it. Keys must not be available to very many people and locks must be changed when a key is lost. Each incoming secretary must be instructed thoroughly in the proper record procedure, the significance of individual personalities, and the importance of their confidences remaining inviolate. Better, by far, to be meticulous and methodical about the record system than to be careless and then spend time worrying. Records are not likely to be stolen, although it has occurred, but precautions bring piece of mind to the counselor who feels responsible to the trust of people, and it is reassuring to clients—to college and university students, especially—to know that their confidences are handled professionally. Every person involved with counseling should understand that information about an individual, including whether he has been or is being seen, is not to be given to *anyone* (even relatives or professional persons) without the specific permission of the client, and then only by the counselor in charge. The only exceptions would be professional consultants used by the counselor and a code system eliminates the necessity of disclosing names to them.

A code system is an added guarantee of confidentiality, since it prevents clients' names appearing in conjunction with any statements about them. A code book or card file containing the names of the clients, their code numbers, and perhaps the interview dates, should be available only to those actually doing counseling. It is best that even the location of the code key be confidential in a relatively uncontrolled environment. A number is assigned to the client by the counselor at the first interview, or, in a setting which warrants it, by the secretary. The name and number go into the code key file; only the number appears with all information. Of course the client does not know his number; only that the records are coded.

Coding methods are limited only by ingenuity, but the simpler the better. Records may be numbered chronologically as persons appear for counseling. All members of the same family may have the same number: the letters M and F may be attached to denote sex; children who are seen become MC and FC; if more than one child of the same family and sex are seen, numbers are added in parentheses to indicate





printed folder which can be filled out by the individual immediately before the initial interview. Part A provides space for "personal data," which enables the person to depict his educational, marital, occupational, financial, religious, cultural, and health statuses, as well as to state the major problems with which he wishes help. Part B is devoted to "family data," which gives vital information about the parental family of the person. Part C is a guide for the individual to use in discussing the personal relationships in his family as an aid to discovering some of the most dynamic factors in counseling preparatory to marriage. It should never be used with a disturbed client except in a controlled situation. Therefore, for general office use the Inventory should be folded inside out and stapled so as to conceal Part C. The final one-half page of the folder provides space for the counselor to record dates of interviews, presenting problems, further difficulties revealed in counseling, and the outcome.

The folder is printed upon paper almost as heavy as the "manila folders" commonly used for filing. Filed with the folded edge down, the code number is on the left upper corner. Interview notes and other papers may be filed within the folder, eliminating the necessity of purchasing and preparing a "file folder." Placed in a standard manila folder the *Inventory* does not protrude but, because over all it is 9 x 11 inches, it is readily found among 8½ x 11 inch papers. Page 2 of the *Inventory* provides space for the name and address of the individual, arranged so that it can be removed with scissors as a card 3 x 5 inches and filed as the code card. Identical numbers are placed on both the *Inventory* folder and the code card. The inventory forms simplify establishing and maintaining a record system and make unnecessary the purchase of either manila folders or file cards.

## IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT VALUES IN EDUCATION AND TEACHING AS RELATED TO GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

RHODA MÉTRAUX\*

In this preface to our discussion, I shall do no more than to suggest certain values which are inherent in our attitudes towards education and, because it would seem to fit in best with our intentions, I shall refer mainly to American attitudes. Nevertheless, because much of what I shall say is so familiar as to be nearly invisible, I shall begin with an illustration from another culture, which may sharpen, through contrast, our view of ourselves.

The values of a culture are reflected in all its aspects, and each detail can be seen in its relationship to the larger whole. In traditional Chinese culture, for instance, calligraphy is much more than a means of setting down ideas—of writing history or making out a household marketing list or teaching the good life—it is also an art form, and some of the great classical scholars have also been poet-painter-writers. The training was a very long one. A little boy, whose family might hope that one day he would be a scholar—a learned man, an artist, and perhaps the governor of a province—began to learn calligraphy when he was five or six years old. Even younger he might have learned to recognize a few characters, made for him with bold brush strokes on bright red cards by his grandfather. Then he was taught to sit at a table, very straight—his body, his feet, his head, his left hand exactly placed, the brush poised in his right hand; and every day he copied models, the meaning of which no one explained to him, which he did not “understand” perhaps for many years. This teaching was more than a skill; it was also a way of forming his moral character. If he continued to practice for ten years, twenty years, thirty years, and mastered the styles of the great calligraphers, he might one day produce something of his own, original because of its strength and vigor. In traditional Chinese culture, not spontaneity but maturity was valued. And this was reflected in the belief that learning and artistry took long years to come to flower, and in the linking of creativeness to mature strength and vigor. Moreover, the training of the classical writer was such that was reflected in body movement; today, as one watches a

\* Dr. Métraux is with the New York Hospital, 525 East 68th Street, New York. Presented at the Second Annual Merrill-Palmer Spring Conference, May 20, 1955. See also MERRILL-PALMER QUARTERLY, 1:131, 1955 and paper following in this issue.

Chinese man sitting and speaking, one can tell what kind of education he has had. The man who in his youth had a classical education, and who still values it, sits upright and easily poised, his hand gestures moving out from the center of his body. The rebel against classical education leans away from this central poise, his movements often out of balance. The young man who has attended only modern schools lounges like any other undergraduate. In these postural alterations we can see more than individual learning experience. We are given clues also to the effects of culture change, of changing values in education, upon the life of the individual.<sup>1</sup>

With this in mind, let us turn to an American situation. For the past several months I have attended a teaching clinic in a hospital in New York City. This has been part not of my research but of my own learning experience of work in a hospital setting. We meet once a week, a small group around a long table, and at each of the sessions one of the participants—it may be an internist, or a psychiatrist, or a medical student, presents a case. The patient comes in and is interviewed, so we can see for ourselves what manner of person this is, who has been described to us. Later any of us, participants or visitors, may ask questions or make suggestions to the physician who has the final responsibility. This clinic is part of a pioneering effort in the teaching of psychosomatic medicine, and the explicit emphasis is upon the wholeness of the individual. With great pride I was told that here the doctors are concerned not with isolated symptoms located somewhere in the body of a "36 year old white female," but with a person, a young woman with parents and brothers, a husband and children, and a unique life history including stressful experiences that have effected adversely her physical, mental, and emotional well-being. Here, in the presence of a group of specialists, the patient—by the shared knowledge of a life history, known and understood—is reconstituted as a whole living person. This is the expressed intention of the teaching. Implicit in it is our American valuation of the uniqueness of the individual and our sense that the total personality—capabilities and experiences, strengths and weaknesses—must be taken into account if we are to understand who someone is.

But listening and watching in that clinic I, who was a novice in a hospital, learned something quite different that also was implicit in the situation: namely, that such teaching can lead to the development of a multiple conscience in each of the participants. For there sat the students and with them around the table perhaps a dozen specialists, *simultaneously* focusing their trained attention upon the complicated problems of one sick person. So the medical student (as perhaps each of us for our work also) is learning for his future practice to hear not one voice of one teacher nor successively the voices of different teach-

ers, but voices arranged in a kind of polyphony. Explicitly, this method of teaching gives back to the student understanding of the wholeness of the person he is observing. Implicitly it gives him also a sense of the wholeness of the approach. Ideally, it gives him a way of thinking, a way of placing his particular aptitudes and knowledge and experience in an inclusive context. And this too is one of the things we value in our kind of education. So, for instance, no matter how lost we may get in the maze of departmental specializations, we continue to trust, at the undergraduate level, the liberal arts type of education. Or at a much younger age level, with our first graders who are just learning to learn formal knowledge, we try to make this not a fragmented but a total experience in which counting and reading and writing and self-expression and social relationships and play and work are all interwoven. Or, in another context, anyone who has worked on an interdisciplinary research project and who has taken part in the struggle really to share materials, to fit all the bits into a meaningful whole, will understand—however different the superficial aspects—the patterning of teaching and learning in the clinic I have so briefly described.

Now I have given this illustration, taken from a rather unfamiliar setting, for two reasons. First, because this attempt to do a new kind of teaching in a medical school—to modify the relationship between teacher and student, to incorporate new knowledge into a method of work, to overcome difficulties that grew out of previous new knowledge, that is, the difficulties resulting from intense specialization—is shaped by ideas and beliefs inherent in our most general thinking about education. This sense of the uniqueness of the individual and of the need for integration is something we may temporarily lose in our attempts to solve other problems, and then we struggle to find it again.

Secondly, I have used this illustration because it places me as a kind of person thinking about and discussing values in education. One thing the anthropologist has learned is to place himself—for himself and others—inside the observations made. And, of course, I speak here as a cultural anthropologist, not as an educator. For, aside from my own training, my main connection with education has been as an indirect participant in the education of my children and some younger colleagues and as an observer, sometimes in American life, sometimes doing field work abroad, sometimes working with informants on a distant culture. So what I can do here is to point out what seem to be certain regularities in our thinking about education and to suggest how these are linked up to our thinking about human growth and development.

It should be said, however, that it is highly artificial to separate our

ideas about education and about growth and development. For one of the most remarkable achievements in our thinking about human beings in the last 50 years or so has been a recognition of the systematic circularity of the learning and teaching processes and of the processes of growth and development. What is new is not the understanding that personality or character are shaped by learning—we have only to turn to any of the old utopias to see that—but that learning and growth are related aspects of man's biological nature. Our new knowledge of maturation and our new understanding of character formation—whether based on our own culture or more broadly on comparisons of cultural materials—have transformed the questions asked and the answers given about learning and teaching; and re-interpretations of educational problems have led us to refine our knowledge of growth. So we have one kind of circularity imposed on another. No less remarkable has been the speed with which we have incorporated this new knowledge into our educational thinking, though often superficially and unevenly into educational practice. Some years ago we could feel as an intensely dramatic climax in a biography the moment when Helen Keller's teacher managed to establish communication with her. Now a large movie audience can feel the dramatic excitement of the moment when, in the movie version of *The Blackboard Jungle*, the young teacher catches the imagination of a classroom group of young hoodlums.<sup>2</sup> Some awareness of the relationship between growth and learning is essential to our recognition of both of these situations as dramatic climaxes.

One thing which this linking up of teaching and learning and growth and development has meant for us is a new sense of the continuity of experience throughout life. In the cultures from which our own traditions have derived, it has been usual to break up education into two main aspects that can be called "up-bringing" and "schooling." In German the terms are *Erziehung* and *Unterricht*; in French they are *formation* and *instruction*.<sup>3</sup> Though in fact they overlap, both aspects of education, so viewed, are highly compartmentalized. There is little need, for example, for French or German parents and teachers to have contact or communication with one another. And both aspects of education are essentially time-limited, although the time span may be different for the two. But in American culture—despite struggles at different times to separate or to bring together home and school—the lines between upbringing at home and education in school have long been blurred. And now, thinking in terms of growth and development—when we have to include pre-natal influences at least on the child's constitution, when we move from the newborn infant's response to the ways it is wrapped and held and fed to the six year old's response to the school environment, to the student's learning of skills, to the

young mother's and father's responses to their own six year old's learning in school . . .—formal education is even more fully incorporated into the whole experience of growing and learning. And, although we have very strong peer group feelings about education—so that we tend to feel that the proper place for a ten year old is in the fifth grade with other ten year olds—we also in American culture do not think of formal education as age-limited. So, in New York City, we have special adult education classes for foreigners who are barely literate, and we have places in our grade room classes for them; and we also have certificates of equivalence for adults who have not completed a stage of formal education, so that a mother can, so to speak, graduate from high school together with her eighteen year old daughter. What this means is that we do have a notion that "education" is something a person can get at any time of life. Furthermore, with the development of our understanding of growth and maturation, with its emphasis upon the child, upon things beginning, we have also begun to consider the possibilities of special kinds of learning for the aged, for those who have already retired. And therefore, however, we approach the problem, it is difficult to visualize "education" as a separate entity.

But from another point of view, education, as we see it, is not at all circular but linear: education is progress, it takes us where we have never been before. Describing what we think higher education has done for us or should do for our children, we are likely to use such images as "new ways" and "open doors" and to picture the liberal arts college as a house with many doors *all* opening out onto the world; or we speak of "broad paths" or "new vistas" or "wider horizons."<sup>4</sup> Considering such images, we can recognize two things. Education is movement—movement forward and outward. And all these images express openness. We are no more willing to shut ourselves up in an ivory tower of learning than, in other circumstances, we are willing to be fenced in. Our conception of education is open-ended. We do not value learning or skills for their own sake, nor the scholar for the sake of his scholarship. We value education for the opportunities learning opens up, for the multiplicity of new directions. So, for example, the studies of American servicemen in World War II written up in *The American Soldier*<sup>5</sup> indicate that while educational status was a factor in a man's promotion, the servicemen themselves did not regard education in itself as an important means to advancement in the services. We think of education as open-ended because it gives the individual tools and skills and trained capacities and a reservoir of knowledge—and perhaps a little "know-how"; we think of the *lack* of education as a real limitation upon what a man can be, but we do not think education determines who a man can be. This open-endedness provides us with a kind of optimism about man's possibilities for



development, both the individual and mankind. It fits together with our belief that we should work with an individual's particular strengths in his education and that we can, given special means, overcome at least in part the difficulties of the poorly endowed, the slow, the incapacitated.

When we think of education in American terms, teaching and learning are bound up in our minds not only with values and performance and dreams, with enriching our heritage, with developing skills that will shape a future as yet unknown, but also, continuously, with the making of new Americans. For we have believed that any individual, by wanting to do so, could become an American and, to a greater or lesser degree, could learn a whole new cultural orientation in a lifetime—a highly unusual belief. Implicit in this is our faith in—for we “believe in”—education and in the human being's continuing powers of adaptation that enable him, if he will, to learn and re-learn, to change from his past to a new present in which he continues as an individual. Partly for this reason, we have been extraordinarily self-conscious about our educational successes and failures and, on the whole, more articulate about more aspects of education than any other people I know about.

And just as we have felt that the individual could learn and re-learn without a break in continuity, without necessarily ever losing a sense of his personal identity (though we recognize as possibilities for those who get caught between two worlds—second generation Americans who do not know where they stand—either loss of identity or some kind of over-rigid identification that is not complete),<sup>6</sup> so too we have kept a kind of flexibility in thinking about education, a willingness to change content and method often and rapidly without fearing that those who have learned one kind of thing one way will necessarily be out of communication with those who have learned another kind of thing another way. We are ready and even eager to look around the world and select, whatever their original context, ways of learning that might add to the enjoyment of our children. We do not expect children to learn as their elders did, or even younger siblings as their elder ones. Instead, we expect elders to make new adaptations and we expect a great deal of learning to take place within the peer group. This has had several consequences for education and for our interpretations of growth and development. For one thing, it means that our present has very shallow roots in the past. In fact, we are even losing the ability to think and feel with the imagery of natural growth that is appropriate to a sense of organic continuity. We are unlikely to think of a new flowering, a new harvest from an old tree. Change is more easily thought of in terms of a new version—a 1955 model car, a 1955 model parent, a 1955 model child, a phrasing which is more congenial to our whole preference for motor imagery.



It also means that we are, in a very real way, perpetual amateurs trying out new things because they are new to us in our own generation as well as because they are genuinely new, and exceedingly dependent on the experiments of our peers in making judgments about success. It is in this light that we must see our tremendous valuation of professionalized skills and of professionalized standards as guides. The importance of standards of excellence may not be so apparent when we think only about ourselves or compare ourselves to a people like the French with their high valuation of individual craftsmanship. But it becomes very clear when we look at some other people whose amateurism—if one may call it that—is not combined with an over-all conception of skill. So for instance, one could consider the culture of Montserrat, a small island in the Leeward Islands Colony of the British West Indies. The peasants of Montserrat have attempted, rather haphazardly, to jettison their whole past, to get rid of their folk tradition and to move into the modern world, at whose outer edge they feel they live. But there, in a sense, each man has been his own innovator and each attempts to interpret and place bits and pieces, to argue with all others about the reality of fragments seen this way or that. There is much emphasis upon "trying it out" and upon "doing your best," but as there is little sense of style in performance or of excellence, these people have come to accept fragmentation, uncertainty and amateurism as themselves making up a style of living which they cannot—and about this they are quite articulate—alter without going away from their island.<sup>7</sup>

There is also another consequence of our valuation of change and of flexibility in teaching and learning, and that is that we have a very continuous need for information, for facts about a new situation or a new idea or a new ethic. We can only act and act responsibly when our understanding is shaped by facts which we share with one another. This has deeply affected our ideas about the dissemination of news. It has influenced our programs of "learning by doing" in progressive education. It is important in any new national situation—such as we faced when rationing became necessary in World War II—when, in the beginning, people see the new in terms of an enormous variety of images; then it is possible to get responsible acceptance only when people are carefully briefed—are not merely told, "Be good, be good" or "Do this, do that," but are given facts on the basis of which they can make a choice and a commitment.<sup>8</sup> This insistence upon the importance of facts is basic in our particular valuation of reality testing, whether we are meeting a crisis, working out a research problem, or encouraging a toddler to move, to reach out, to taste and smell and touch the objects that make up his world.

In this brief paper I have attempted to indicate what some Ameri-

can values are in education. Looking at education not as an educator but as a cultural anthropologist, I have thought of these different things—our valuation of the uniqueness of the individual, our sense of the whole, our sense of continuity which does not necessarily imply continuity of content, our sense of the open-endedness of learning, our belief in the possibility of change and in its beneficence—as important themes in American culture which are expressed in various ways in education as in other aspects of living. I have not attempted to differentiate between what is made explicit and what remains implicit because in different contexts the same value may be expressed in one or the other way. Rather what I have tried to do is to suggest to you certain themes, certain values which we share as Americans and which are relevant to our thought and feeling and action whether we are concerned specifically with problems of education and teaching or with problems of growth and development or with the relationships of growth and education to our whole style of life.

#### REFERENCES

1. For background material on Chinese child training and education, cf. Ruth Bunzel: *Explorations in Chinese Culture* (New York, Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures, 1950, dittoed). For an autobiographical description of classical education, cf. Chiang Yee: *A Chinese Childhood* (New York, John Day, 1952). The material on posture is taken from unpublished research in the Study Program on Human Health and the Ecology of Man—China, Cornell Medical College—New York Hospital.
2. Evan Hunter: *The Blackboard Jungle* (New York, Pocket Books, 1955). Screen version, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (1955). The screen version has picked up and amplified this theme, altering the whole emphasis of the story.
3. On German attitudes towards upbringing and education, cf. three articles by Rhoda Metraux in Margaret Mead and Martha Wolfenstein: *Child Rearing in Contemporary Cultures* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, in press). For France, cf. Rhoda Metraux and Margaret Mead: *Themes in French Culture, A Preface to a Study of French Community* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1954).
4. Patricia W. Cautley: *AAUW Members Look at College Education, An Interim Report* (Washington, D.C., American Association of University Women, 1949).
5. S. A. Stouffer, et al.: *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, 4 vols. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1949-50).
6. This is always a factor to be considered in understanding the American material on prejudice and on "the authoritarian personality" as described e.g. in the several volumes of *Studies in Prejudice*, edited by Max Horkheimer and Samuel H. Flowerman (New York, Harpers, 1949-50).
7. Based on unpublished field work in Montserrat, B.W.I., 1953-1954, by Rhoda Metraux and Theodora M. Abel.
8. Based on qualitative attitude analyses made for the Committee on Food Habits, National Research Council, 1942-1943.

## IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT VALUES IN THE GROUP PROCESS AS RELATED TO HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

AARON STERN\*

The human being is fortunately and unfortunately a highly socialized animal. Fortunate, because social life permits the weaker and less effective to survive by virtue of interdependence, which provides the individual with family and friends for personal support. Unfortunate, because any culture is limiting from the start and demands of each participating member that he give up personal gratification in order to belong.

For the child, growth is characterized by a continuous and conflicting interaction between his unique needs as a developing human animal and those of his older, more powerful parents who assume the responsibility for transmitting the culture and converting him into a socially acceptable human being. Such a conversion involves a great number of learning experiences which begin at birth, and are designed to make the newborn infant modify his innate behavior to fit into an externally ordered pattern in order to obtain a position in the family configuration. By virtue of the child's paramount need for parent love, cultivated through early gratification for nourishment, warmth, touch, and the like, he grows to become dependent. This same sense of dependency, born of the neonate's critical need for personal care is ultimately translated to parent love. The dependence is what makes one subsequently amenable to social restraints and injunctions. The need for parental love and approval grows with adulthood into the desire for social approval and society becomes an extension of the smaller family unit. Thus, to live socially requires that the child become dependent upon the very people, who by virtue of conflicting needs, both in terms of their own unresolved infantile drives, and the cultural demands placed upon the social role of the parent figure, will often function to frustrate him.

From the thesis described up to this point, it follows that in order to achieve socialization, dependence should be cultivated during early life and the infant's role as a "helpless animal" be solicited. However, to maintain our culture the dependent child must somehow emerge as

\* Dr. Stern is a psychologist and physician with the Department of Pediatrics, College of Medicine at New York City (Brooklyn), State University of New York. Presented at the Second Annual Merrill-Palmer Spring Conference, May 19, 1955. Another paper from this Conference will appear in the Winter issue of the Quarterly.

a dependable adult with enough feelings of personal adequacy and self-sufficiency to assume the responsibility for giving support to other more dependent people, and for transmitting the culture to the succeeding generation of unsocialized infants. This introduces the social liability of neurosis which is intimately related to the lifelong struggle for personal gratification, a process which involves parental independence and is therefore in conflict with cultural dependency. In terms of guidance we are faced with a sensitive balance between premature independence, which would inhibit socialization and could result in antisocial or asocial behavior, and over dependence on the other hand, which could manifest itself in terms of persistent patterns of infantile behavior. The problem becomes even more challenging when we realize that much personally gratifying behavior is asocial in character and for the child to effectively yield such individual satisfaction, there must be an even greater reward for him in terms of the learned need for parental love. This implies that early infantile experiences should be designed by the parent as primarily giving ones, in order to effect the kind of conditioning which would identify the parent as a positive figure whose approval is more meaningful than the gratification of some of the other needs the infant experiences (weaning, toilet training, etc.). It is important to appreciate that such a "giving role" is consistent with parental needs in terms of manifesting their own metamorphosis from a dependent child into a dependable adult; in a sense the parent role supports one's social status as an elder and can therefore be a difficult adjustment for those who were unable to sufficiently gratify their own dependent needs prior to undertaking the responsibility for the care of another. The parents essentially subscribe to the infant's needs in order to satisfy their own, both in terms of feelings of social adequacy and the development of a relationship which would permit them to effectively modify the child's behavior in order that it may fit more adequately into the prevailing cultural patterns. Thus, the parent gets a good deal from the infant in servicing certain of the child's needs. This concept is in opposition to the idea that the parent gives and the infant takes; it would be more realistic to recognize that the parent gives and takes as well, and that almost from the time of conception there begins a reciprocal interaction rewarding to each.

From our experience with psychotherapy, we have grown to appreciate that the idiosyncratic elements in the behavior of an individual can be understood only in terms of his reservoir of experiences. Historically this is critically related to the family unit which is often regarded as an entity separate from the outside, culturally determined experiences. Such a dichotomous breakdown is self-contradictory in light of the recognition that the significance of family experiences in

early personality development has grown from the characteristic nature of these experiences in terms of the cultural development of the family in our own social setting. We restrict the child's early contacts to a small distinct group confined to a single pair of parents, and sometimes other siblings, and offer outside the home contacts only after one has learned to respond to the rules of the household into which he was born. These household rules are nothing more than conditions for the existence of the family as a social group, and the need for parental love provides a force through which these rules become obligatory to the child. It is not the obligatory character of the rule laid down by a parent or an older sibling that makes the child respect the individual, but it is the respect he feels for the individual that makes him regard as obligatory the rule laid down. Through acceptance and love the child develops a feeling of respect for parents and older children and the commands he receives from these parents and the older children contribute to the development of a sense of duty in the child.

In terms of our cultural values, we can therefore, identify three developmental stages through which the child must pass successfully in order to function effectively as an adult in our society. He must first develop a strong sense of parental love, which will manifest itself in the need for parental approval; a need which will function as a critical mechanism in the development of dependency. As an inevitable outcome of the mechanics of this dependent interaction, the child comes to learn the necessity for self-deprivation; a process during which he modifies and often yields gratifying behavior for parental acceptance. This is particularly marked in learning to deal with expressions of sexuality and aggression. At this point, the child has become a social animal and consequently a dependent one. The feelings of dependency which contributed to socialization during childhood, however, must later be resolved, in part, at least, in passing from childhood to adulthood, and concurrently from the role of recipient of the culture to that of transmitter and guardian of the culture. As a means to this end effective devices must be developed to deal with the tensions resulting from the thwarting and frustration of infantile needs. Thus, inherent in the attainment of more independent behavior is the development of a system of defenses designed to reduce anxiety by alternate substitute behavior when experiences threaten one's self concept, which, in part, reflects the social role that the individual has chosen to adopt. This then, becomes the major problem of child growth in our culture—he must be made dependent initially in order to obtain socialization, and then emerge independent enough, with sufficient feelings of self-adequacy, for the resolution of tensions resulting from the earlier infantile dependence. It may therefore, be argued that during the early years of life, we take away gratifications from the child,

who, in turn, embarks on a lifelong struggle to achieve the skills necessary for adjustment; adjustment in this sense meaning an attempt to obtain gratification possibly in a less satisfying but socially acceptable (parentally approved) manner.

At the time of birth, the human child is a complete animal, capable of the vital biological functions but incapable of social survival. The links to survival are the parents who enhance the attainment of nourishment, warmth, and the need for contact, but who frustrate some of the needs for psychosexual gratification and expressions of aggression. Thus, the newborn is a positive functioning person who soon disrupts his totality by modifying some of his behavior in exchange for parental approval and love, as a means for survival. The parents then become concerned with techniques of child care as a means for restoring as much of the totality as possible.

One of the means which has emerged for supporting and promoting individual autonomy is the group experience. Among the sum of social relations which makes up our society, we can distinguish two markedly different human experiences; relations of constraint whose characteristic is to impose upon the individual from outside a system of rules with obligatory content, and relations of cooperation whose characteristic is to create within people's minds the consciousness of values that form the basis of all rules. Cooperation leads to autonomy and individuality. Within the group, growth is not a function of respect directed to the group and resulting from the pressure exercised by the group upon the individual, but is a process which is directed to individuals and is the outcome of the relation of individuals amongst themselves. This is important to consider, for it implies that the group process is solely a vehicle for individual interaction within the framework setup by the needs of the personalities participating. It does not, in this light, become a means for group change through skillful leadership, as any assertive leadership would set up dependent responses by the membership and thereby result in thwarting independent behavior. Effective group experiences are determined by the development of meaningful relationships among the individuals involved, and in any interpersonal experience meaningful relationships are those in which the individual is involved as a feeling as well as a knowing person; such wholistic involvement would result in repeated self-evaluations as a consequence of the perceptual differences between and among the individuals involved.

If one regards a group experience as a medium intended to enhance individuality, then it follows that every gathering of individuals does not constitute a group, in this special sense. The degree of groupness would be measured in terms of the extent to which individuals express their differences to one another, by virtue of freedom from



parental approval, which in this case is represented by the leader. Thus, effective group leadership is characterized by minimal participation in order to effect interaction; the good leader, in time, can leave the group and not significantly alter the quality of the experience for the membership because of the stability of the relationships among the individuals which has developed. Ineffective leadership is one which directs dependence upon the leader, who takes responsibility for the rate and direction of the group activities, and thereby retards individual autonomy. In a fashion similar to the process described previously in terms of the developing child, the group may first be dependent upon the leader, who is often the stimulus for organization and scheduled meetings, but from this early dependency must ultimately emerge more independent, at which time the group behavior would reflect the expressions of individual member needs. Thus, the goals for any given group must be limited to whatever behavior represents the results of individual interaction among as many of the members as possible.

There is at least one other significant limitation inherent in viewing the group process as a medium for enhancing autonomy and individuality; only those members who bring with them some minimal ego strength accompanied by feelings of adequacy can effectively interact with other group members and thereby profit significantly from the experience. In this sense, within the "realms of normality", the more the individual brings to the group in terms of independent, mature behavior, the greater is his potential for supporting and promoting his feelings of individual autonomy from the process. The group should therefore, be made up of individuals capable of giving to each other. This questions the therapeutic value of group experiences with markedly disturbed people.

In child development, we find that cooperation is at first a source of criticism, thanks to the mutual interaction which it involves, and therefore functions to suppress egocentrism and blind faith in authority. Discussion gives rise to reflection and more objective verification, and through this very process yields greater individual autonomy. Cooperation becomes a source of constructive values growing from a common search to truth. It becomes above all an experience which promotes the recognition of the principle of individual differences, since reciprocity even on the intellectual plane, requires the elaboration of perceptual differences in our behavior.

## M-P PLANS AND PROJECTS

### THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

Four "Open Houses" were held by The Merrill-Palmer School prior to the Symposium in December. The first, October 14, was attended by over 150 former staff members and students. October 28 some 65 former M-P parents and children were entertained and November 11 members of 50 current M-P families visited the School. Over 350 representatives of various civic groups came to the Open House November 18. All the guests were enthusiastic in renewing acquaintances, meeting present staff members, and learning more about the program of the School.

These groups and many other persons from the Detroit area and throughout the United States were sent invitations to the Anniversary Symposium.

#### *The Merrill-Palmer School Thirty-Fifth Anniversary Symposium*

##### **The Effective Family: Today and tomorrow**

DECEMBER 7, 8:00 P.M.

Presiding: **James K. Watkins**, Vice-President, Board of Trustees

Introduction: **Pauline Park Wilson Knapp**, Director, The Merrill-Palmer School

##### *Persistence of an Idea*

**Mary E. Sweeny**, Formerly Assistant Director, The Merrill-Palmer School

##### *The Family in 1955*

**Theodore H. Newcomb**, Professor of Sociology and of Psychology, University of Michigan

##### *The Role of Higher Education in Contributing to Family Life Today*

**John A. Hannah**, President, Michigan State University

DECEMBER 8, 9:30 A.M.

##### **Open House at The Merrill-Palmer School**

DECEMBER 8, 2:30 P.M.

Presiding: **Mrs. Ross Wilkins, Jr.**, Chairman, Board of Directors, The Merrill-Palmer School.

***Forces Influencing the Effectiveness of Families Today***

- Panel: **Muriel Brown**, Consultant in Community Education, Division of International Education, Washington, D.C., Chairman  
**Joseph Johnston, M.D.**, Head of Pediatrics, Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit  
**Paul Rankin**, Assistant Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools  
**Irma Gross**, Professor and Head of Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University  
**Lillian Gilbreth**, President, Gilbreth, Inc., Consulting Engineers in Management

DECEMBER 8, 8:00 P.M.

Presiding: **George B. Duffield**, President, The Merrill-Palmer School Corporation

***Sources of Strength for Effective Family Living***

**Strength which can be developed from within**

**Marie I. Rasey**, Professor of Educational Psychology, Wayne University

**Strength which can be drawn from without**

**Lawrence K. Frank**, Visiting Faculty of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and formerly Director, Caroline Zachary Institute

DECEMBER 9, 2:30 P.M.

Presiding: **Mrs. Earl I. Heenan, Jr.**, Member, Board of Directors, The Merrill-Palmer School

***What Lies Ahead for Effective Family Life?***

**The sources of future strengths**

Panel: **Lawrence K. Frank**, Chairman

**Martha MacDonald**, Psychiatrist, Sarasota, Florida

**Ernest Osborne**, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

**Oskar Stonorov**, Architect, Philadelphia

**Merrill-Palmer's Potential Contribution**

**Pauline Park Wilson Knapp**, Director, The Merrill-Palmer School

**CONFERENCE OF STATE HOME DEMONSTRATION AGENTS**

The Merrill-Palmer School programs in teaching, research and service were presented to State Demonstration Agents during a conference at the School November 17-19. Participants were: Miss Ellang Vestad, Norway; Miss Nellie McLoughlin, South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; Miss Delores Morales, Puerto Rico; Miss Helen Prout, State College of Washington; Miss Louise Rosenfeld, Iowa State College; Miss Lydia Tarrant, Pennsylvania State University; Miss Ellen LeNoir, Louisiana State University; Miss Earle Gaddis, Mississippi State College; Miss Doris Anders, University of Connecticut; Miss Frances Clinton, Oregon State College; Miss Florence At-

wood, University of Nebraska; Miss Mary Collings, U. S. Department of Agriculture; Mrs. Leona D. MacLeod, Michigan State University; and Miss Mena Hogan, Federal Extension Office, Washington, D.C.

Also attending the Conference were representatives of some of the Land Grant Colleges: Dr. Lela O'Toole, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College; Dr. Rebecca Pate, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College; Miss Ouida Abbott, University of Florida; Miss Janice Smith, University of Illinois; Dr. Marion Spidle, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; Dr. Clara Tucker, Louisiana State University; Dr. Frances Hettler, South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; and Dr. Katherine Roberts, Woman's College of North Carolina.

#### MERRILL-PALMER ETV TELECASTS

The first series of Merrill-Palmer telecasts with the general title *Building Family Strength* was completed in November. Under the subtitle "Independence-Dependence" staff members led discussions with parents, high school students, and M-P undergraduate and graduate students as the subject involved young children, teen-agers, married couples, college students and people who have reached "later maturity."

The second series on *Building Family Strength* covers the area of "Participation" and is being presented each Tuesday over WTVS, Channel 56, from 10:30 to 11:00 A.M. The titles are "Toys from the Family Workshop"; "Mealtimes are Family Times"; "Teenagers in the Family"; "Families have fun together"; "The Handicapped Child Joins In"; "Your Share in Your Community"; and, "At Home With Music."

Although knowledge of techniques and procedures for effective use of television in education is rapidly expanding there are no "experts" in the field. The M-P programs have limited intrinsic value because the viewing audience is restricted to those families who have purchased an all-wave (Channels 2-83) receiver and those who have converted their VHF (Channels 2-13) sets to receive Channel 56. However, as the audience increases the M-P programs will develop greater effectiveness from the knowledge gained by experimentation. As part of this experimental effort the audible aspect of some of the telecasts is being put on tape and is available for use in teaching and for publication. Later, both the audio and video portions of programs may be put on film (kinescoped) and made available for use locally and on other ETV Stations in the United States.

## Book Review

**ANTICIPATING YOUR MARRIAGE.** Robert O. Blood. 455 pages; recommended readings; bibliography; index. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955. \$5.00.

"So many books about marriage are available that the reader has a right to ask what this one has to offer." Thus begins the preface to Robert O. Blood's book, *Anticipating Your Marriage*. It was with this question in mind that the reviewer set about his task of appraisal.

*Anticipating Your Marriage*, "designed for those with no previous preparation in sociology, psychology, or allied fields," is a useful book carefully conceived and written. The book is also an extensive work covering the gamut of topics from "Dating" to "Relating the Family to the Community."

The writing is informal, unstilted and a model of simplicity. The minimal usage of technical terminology and avoidance of too frequent reference to statistical data enhance the style and provide for better communication. Broad utilization of case material from the author's teaching, counseling, and research experience affords the reader a more meaningful and dynamic interpretation.

Although every chapter in the book has merit, each reader will according to his needs, or predilections, find some chapters of greater interest and import than others. The reviewer was especially impressed by the treatment given to the chapters, "Dating", "Growing in Love", "Giving Physical Expression to Love", and "Deciding When to Marry". In these chapters one is not only exposed to the "best available knowledge," but the author has demonstrated realistically the potentially positive as well as negative consequences of various kinds of premarital interpersonal activities. The former is especially significant in view of the tendency of some writers to emphasize the potentially negative consequences of activities such as premarital sexual expression. Blood's implication that interpersonal relations do not consist simply of such absolutes as *black and white*, *good and evil*, *moral behavior and immoral behavior* serves to communicate his respect for the individuality of human behavior.

In a society where the subject of education for marriage and family living is rife with intense feeling and controversy, Dr. Blood is to be commended for his objective, straightforward and honest interpretations of the "facts" of present-day living. Young people eager to learn

about these "facts" are certain to welcome this contribution to their self-explorations.

*Anticipating Your Marriage*, like other texts so extensive in scope, tends at time to lack depth. This does not alter its importance, however, for as supplementary reading to class discussion the book should serve well to stimulate student thought and participation.

For those persons, both lay and professional, interested in a sane approach to the discussion of the problems inherent to preparation for marriage the reviewer recommends, without reservation, reading Robert O. Blood's book.

Paul Vahanian

*Counseling Service*

*The Merrill-Palmer School*

### PUBLICATION NOTICE

THE LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT. Techniques for Appraising Developmental Status and Progress. Leland H. Stott. x + 116 pages. Published by THE MERRILL-PALMER SCHOOL, Detroit, 1955. \$2.75.

"The present book is in many ways the outcome of a unique approach to the teaching of child development which has evolved over the past twelve years at The Merrill-Palmer School. This approach involves the actual firsthand study, by each of the students, of a particular child available for observation, usually in the Nursery School or Recreational Clubs, as well as in his own home and neighborhood. Each of these children is a member of a family participating in the Longitudinal Studies program. In addition to the actual child and his family, individual and family developmental records are in each case available for study.

\* \* \*

"To facilitate the student's task, the various methods and specific techniques which are available, and which seem most appropriate to the task, are presented. Certain rating and graphic forms have been devised specifically for the course. Each of these devices naturally has its obvious limitations and is open to criticism from one or another theoretical point of view. They nevertheless contribute, each in its way, to an understanding of the child and his development."

— From the Author's Preface



r  
r  
>  
l  
e  
a  
g  
  
s  
.  
.  
.  
r  
a  
l  
e  
l  
a  
  
e  
o  
a  
s  
c  
s.